

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached Replacement sheets of drawings including Figures 1 to 5 and 9 replace the original sheets containing Figures 1 to 5 and 9. Approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Attachment: five (5) Replacement sheets

REMARKS

Claims 11 to 20 are now pending and being considered in the present application. In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation the acknowledgement of the claims for foreign priority and the indication that all of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the previously filed information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449 paper, and cited references.

The drawings were objected to for failure to include descriptive legends. The drawings have been amended herein to obviate the present objection. Withdrawal of the objections is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 11 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0010424 (the "Osmer" reference) and Denuto et al., "LIN Bus and its Potential for use in Distributed Multiplex Applications" (the "Denuto" reference). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of the "Osmer" and "Denuto" references does not render unpatentable the present claims, and the rejection should be withdrawn, for the following reasons.

To reject a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Office bears the initial burden of presenting a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). To establish *prima facie* obviousness, three criteria must be satisfied. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify or combine reference teachings. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). This teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination must be found in the prior art and not based on the application disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. *In re Merck & Co., Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 U.S.P.Q. 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Third, the prior art reference(s) must teach or suggest all of the claim features. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974).

Regarding claim 11, the Office Action admits that the "Osmer" reference does not disclose a single wire bus and refers to the "Denuto" reference as assertedly disclosing this feature. The Office Action alleges that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a single wire bus since this reduces the number of wires needed in the system." However, prior art references must be considered as a whole, including portions that teach away

from the claimed subject matter. *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. C.r. 1983). The “Osmer” reference relates to an analog signal-based system and, thus, cannot be readily combined with the single wire multiplexing approach of the “Denuto” reference. The “Osmer” reference describes an analog signaling approach in that the “force is measured by resistors 60 as an electrical signal that changes with the occupants weight and is transmitted over a wire harness 58 to air bag controller 36. The voltage level of each resistor can be correlated to a specific weight at each sensor location.” See the “Osmer” reference, page 3, lines 9 to 14 and Fig 1. The “Denuto” reference refers to a bus-system applicable only to digital signals. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would not modify the system of the “Osmer” reference to include the bus system of the “Denuto” reference.

Claims 12 to 16 depend from claim 11 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 12. *In re Fine, supra* (any dependent claim that depends from a non-obvious independent claim is non-obvious).

Withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claims 11 to 16 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 17 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the “Osmer” reference and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0172462 (the “Rudduck” reference). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of the “Osmer” and “Rudduck” references does not render unpatentable the present claims, and the rejection should be withdrawn, for the following reasons.

In the “Osmer” reference, each sensor is hard wired and has a dedicated path to the controller. All the sensors are scanned, through their **dedicated paths, at the same time** by the controller to determine the proper airbag deployment. “At step 102, sensors 50A, B, C and D are scanned.” See, the “Osmer” reference, paragraph [0037] and Figure 5. There is **no requirement for or benefit to addressing** because data from the sensors are received over dedicated paths and no data is returned to the sensors from the controller. In the “Rudduck” reference, on the other hand, an address is provided because a controller separately controls each component. In this regard, “[t]he fastener has address means which serve to distinguish the fastener from the other fasteners in the network,” see the Abstract in the “Rudduck” reference, which enables the controller to activate each component separately. The purpose is to “provide a system of fasteners which can be part of an array, which can be individually addressable and which can enable an orderly, predictable way of accessing replaceable components in assemblies, for example, in order to remove a radio unit from a motor vehicle.” See the “Rudduck”

reference, paragraph [0006]. Therefore, one skilled in the art would not modify the “Osmer” reference to combine the features of the “Rudduck” reference because addressing each component is not necessary or desirable in light of the dedicated wiring.

Accordingly, claim 17 is allowable, as is its dependent claim 18.

Regarding claim 19, the Office Action admits that the “Osmer” reference does not disclose a bus system having a single-wire bus. Instead, the Office Action refers to paragraph [0088] of the “Rudduck” reference as assertedly disclosing this feature. As an initial matter, paragraph [0088] of the “Rudduck” reference does not disclose a single wire bus as asserted in the office action. Further, as discussed in the context of claim 11, the “Osmer” reference transmits analog signals over a wire harness 58 to air bag controller 36, where the “voltage level of each resistor can be correlated to a specific weight at each sensor location.” See the “Osmer” reference, paragraph [0031] and Fig 1. Replacing the wire harness 58 with a single wire bus is not feasible due to the signals being analog in nature and not digital. The “Rudduck” reference does not cure this defect because it deals with **digital** addressing of fasteners.

Thus, the combination of the “Osmer” and “Rudduck” references does not disclose or suggest each feature of claim 19, so that claim 19 and its dependent claim 20 are allowable.

Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 17 to 20 is therefore respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of claims 11 to 20 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections and rejections be withdrawn. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore respectfully requested.

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/580,388
Attorney Docket No. 10191/4156
Response to Office Action of September 11, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: December 10, 2007

By: /s/ Gerard A. Messina (Reg. No. 59,210) for:
Gerard A. Messina
(Reg. No. 35,952)

One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646